DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 445 CG 028 056

AUTHOR	Reinhardt, Brian
TITLE	Examining Correlates of Homophobia in Heterosexual College Students.
PUB DATE	1997-08-17
NOTE	35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (105th, Chicago, IL, August 15-19, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bias; *College Environment; *College Students; Higher Education; *Homophobia; Homosexuality; Lesbianism; Religious Factors; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; Student College Relationship; Student Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Self Report Measures

ABSTRACT

Initial efforts to study the prevalence of homophobia targeted specific groups such as college students, health care workers, social workers, and others. Some of the specific correlates of homophobia, including gender, previous contact with gay people, the quality of that contact, religious affiliation, and the degree of religious practice are examined in this paper. The subjects, 200 female and 120 male undergraduates enrolled in human sexuality classes at a large university, completed informational surveys and self-report measures of homophobia. Homophobia was measured via self-reports of cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of anti-gay and anti-gay prejudice. Results showed that women reported lower levels of homophobia than men in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral measures, and that both men and women indicated lower levels of cognitive homophobia toward lesbians when compared to gay men. Homophobia negatively correlated with (1) previous contact with gay men and lesbians, (2) the degree of positive previous interaction with gay people, and (3) the number of gay and lesbian friends and acquaintances, but not family members. The levels of self-reported anti-gay attitudes positively correlated with church attendance, but not church affiliation. Limitations of the study, along with future directions for research, are offered. (Contains 63 references and 7 tables.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 445

Examining Correlates of Homophobia in Heterosexual College Students

Brian Reinhardt, Ph.D.

Indiana University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Reinhardt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the 105th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL, August 17, 1997.

CG028056

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The present study explored specific correlates of homophobia. Two hundred female and 120 male undergraduate students completed informational surveys and self-report measures of homophobia. Results showed that women reported lower levels of homophobia than men in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral measures, and that both men and women indicated lower levels of cognitive homophobia toward lesbians than gay men. Homophobia negatively correlated with previous contact with gay men and lesbians, the degree of positive previous interaction with gay people, and the number of gay and lesbian friends and acquaintances, but not family members. Finally, the levels of self-reported anti-gay attitudes positively correlated with church attendance, but not church affiliation. Limitations of the study are discussed and future directions for research are offered.

Examining Correlates of Homophobia in Heterosexual College Students

Problem Statement

The present study explored specific correlates of homophobia including gender, previous contact with gay people, the quality of that contact, religious affiliation, and the degree of religious practice. The subjects, 200 female and 120 male undergraduate students enrolled in human sexuality classes at a large southwestern university, completed informational surveys and self-report measures of homophobia.

Individual homophobia in the present study is defined as **prejudice that leads to hatred and/or discrimination toward lesbians and gay men and is manifested through anti-gay feelings, thoughts and behaviors that are socially determined and maintained**.

Homophobia was measured via self-reports of cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of anti-gay and anti-gay prejudice. The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale (Herek, 1988) was used to measure cognitive notions about homophobia. Also, the ATLG yielded two scores, separating attitudes toward gay men from attitudes toward lesbians. The Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) was used to measure affective attitudes toward gay and lesbian people. The behavioral component of homophobia was measured using a questionnaire asking participants to indicate to what degree they would engage in 10 different gay affirmative behaviors.

The following hypotheses were evaluated:

1. Women will report lower levels of homophobia than men in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral measures.

2. Both men and women will report lower levels of cognitive homophobia toward lesbians than gay men.

3. Homophobia will negatively correlate with previous contact with gay men and lesbians, with the degree of positive previous interaction with gay people, and with the number of gay and lesbian friends, family members, and acquaintances.

4. Levels of self-reported anti-gay attitudes will positively correlate with religiosity (if someone is affiliated with a church and how often (s)he attends the church).

Heterosexuals' Attitudes and Actions Toward Lesbians and Gay Men

Initial efforts to study the prevalence of homophobia targeted specific groups such as college students, health care workers, social workers, and others. Hudson and Ricketts (1980) reported that between 1971 and 1978 no fewer than 31 reports of attitudinal studies in this area appeared. Since the 1970s many other investigators have examined specific groups of heterosexuals' attitudes toward gays and lesbians. Recent studies surveyed health care workers (Schwanberg, 1990), nurses (Scherer, Wu, & Haughey, 1991), social workers (Wisniewski & Toomey, 1987), mental health professionals (DeCrescenzo, 1983/84), and college students (Conner, Richman, Wallace, & Tilquin, 1990; D'Augelli, 1989a, 1989b; D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Ficarrotto, 1990; Norris, 1991; Page & Yee, 1985; Poling, Redmon, & Burnette, 1990; Reynolds, 1989; Yarber & Yee, 1983; Young & Whertvine, 1982). All of the researchers in these studies found evidence of high levels of homophobia within all the groups.

A U.S. News poll (Shapiro, Cook, & Krackov, 1993) indicated that Americans are experiencing some ambiguity about attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Fifty-three percent of American voters who were surveyed said that they personally know someone who is gay and this familiarity tends to make them think more favorably about equal rights for gay people. Forty-six percent said that they do not know anyone gay and they largely oppose equal rights for lesbians and gay men. These figures suggest that there have been changes in Americans' attitudes toward gay people since the early 1980s.

Although polls indicate that there is an increasing percentage of Americans that favor equal rights for lesbian and gay people, studies completed with college students indicate that compared with other minority groups, the most severe hostilities are directed at gay people (Berrill, 1990). In a review of recent surveys on anti-gay hate crimes, Herek (1989, p. 948) reported that "as many as 92% of lesbians and gay men report that they have been targets of anti-gay verbal abuse or threats, and as many as 24% report physical attacks because of their sexual orientation." These alarming percentages constitute a serious national problem, in his opinion. D'Augelli (1991) suggested that as more college-age students come out of the closet, more direct acts of homophobia will occur on campuses. Berrill (1990) summarized survey results from several university studies:

> In studies of anti-gay violence and harassment at Yale (Herek, 1986b), Rutgers (Cavin, 1987), and Penn State (D'Augelli, 1989a), approximately 5% of the respondents had been punched, hit, kicked, or beaten at some point in their college careers; 16% to 26% had been threatened with physical violence, and 55% to 76% had been verbally harassed. Similar rates of victimization were documented at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (Yeskel, 1985) and at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne (O'Shaughnessey, 1987). Among the gay, lesbian, and bisexual students surveyed at the University of Massachusetts (n = 174),

> 45% had been verbally threatened or harassed, and 21% had been physically confronted or assaulted. Rates of such abuse at the University of Illinois (n = 92) were 58% and 15%, respectively. (p. 285)

Findings of a survey of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at Texas A&M University (n = 61) indicated that 75% had been verbally harassed, 40% were threatened with violence, 32% had been chased, spat on, or punched, and 8% had been assaulted with a weapon (Stock, 1993). These rates of victimization appear to be higher than those reported for other universities. Although the studies cited above all used non-representative convenience samples of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students, they document a severe problem of incidents of anti-gay violence on campuses.

Two studies used representative samples in ascertaining the incidence of anti-gay violence and harassment on their campuses. Norris (1991) surveyed the entire student body at Oberlin College. Of the gay, lesbian, and bisexual students who returned the survey (n = 111), 40% had been verbally harassed, 5 to 14% had objects thrown at them, were followed or chased, or spat upon, and 1% were assaulted or wounded. In a random survey at the University of California at Santa Cruz (Nelson & Baker, 1990), 40% of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students reported that they had been verbally harassed. Even with more representative samples, the reported incidents of anti-gay harassment and violence is very high. Table 1 summarizes the rates of anti-gay victimization reported by gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at five colleges and universities.

Despite the widespread self-reported victimization of gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) students at universities across the United States, there is some evidence that there also coexists a high degree of support and tolerance toward GLB students. For example, at the same college where 40% of the GLB students surveyed indicated that they had been verbally harassed because of their sexual orientation, and 14% had been followed or chased, 96% of heterosexual students surveyed said that they overwhelmingly supported the presence of GLB students on campus (Norris, 1991). However, 20 to 25% of male heterosexuals and 9 to 12% of female heterosexuals felt that they had to conceal their support for GLB people for fear of negative consequences. In the same study, 95% of all heterosexual students surveyed indicated that they would not refuse to live with a gay, lesbian, or bisexual person.

The research reviewed suggests that on college campuses and across the United States in general, heterosexuals' self-reported attitudes toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual people are changing in a positive direction. However, incidents of overt homophobic actions occur at an alarming rate. As Herek (1989) pointed out, it is difficult to determine if anti-gay violence is actually on the rise or if more is being reported. Homophobic attitudes that lead to overt anti-gay violence are clearly the most dangerous and in need of intervention; however, they may be the most difficult to change effectively.

Correlates of Anti-gay Attitudes

Many of the empirical attitudinal studies completed during the last two decades looked at the relationships between homophobia and various attitudinal and demographic variables. In general, some consistent patterns have been observed across different samples. The following variables have been correlated with negative attitudes toward gay people:

1. Gender. Males have higher self-reported levels of homophobia than females (Aguero, Bloch, & Byrne, 1984; Kite, 1984; Patoglun-an & Clair, 1986).

2. Age and education. Older and less educated individuals tend to report more negative attitudes toward gay people (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Klassen, Williams, & Levitt, 1989). It should be noted that the age effects may be manifestations of the cohorts to which the individuals belonged.

3. Area of residence. Individuals reporting homophobic attitudes are more likely to have resided in areas where negative attitudes are the norm (e.g., midwestern and southern United States, Canadian prairies, and in rural areas and small towns), especially during adolescence (Hansen, 1982a; Stephan & McMullin, 1982; Whitehead & Metzger, 1981).

4. General religious conservativism. Homophobic individuals are more likely to be religious, to attend church regularly, and to subscribe to a conservative religious ideology (Cameron & Ross, 1981; Hansen, 1982b; Herek, 1984b; Larsen, Cate, & Reed, 1983; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980).

5. Gender roles. Homophobia is related to a need to maintain traditional attitudes about gender roles (Black & Stevenson, 1984; Krulewitz & Nash, 1980; Laner & Laner, 1980).

6. Sexual guilt. Individuals reporting negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men are less permissive sexually or manifest more guilt or negativity about sexuality (Ernulf & Innala 1987; Young & Whertvine, 1982).

7. Authoritarianism. Homophobic individuals are more likely to manifest high levels of authoritarianism and related personality characteristics (Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980).

8. Interaction. Persons with negative attitudes toward gay people are less likely to have had personal contact with lesbians or gay men (D'Augelli, 1989b; D'Augelli & Rose, 1990; Hansen, 1982a; Lance, 1987; Patoglun-an & Clair, 1986).

9. Peer attitudes. Homophobic individuals are more likely to perceive their peers as manifesting negative attitudes toward gay people, especially if the respondents are males (Herek, 1984b; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980).

10. Racism. Anti-gay prejudice has been found to correlate with racism and less accepting attitudes toward others in general, including persons living with AIDS (Conner, Rickman, Wallace, & Tilquin, 1990; Croteau & Morgan, 1989; Ficarrotto, 1990; McDevitt, Sheehan, Lennon, & Ambrosio, 1990; Poling, Redmon, & Burnette, 1990).

These correlates of homophobia give support to the argument that negative attitudes toward gay people are not compartmentalized "phobias" which do not correlate highly with social beliefs. These findings support the notion that an individual's attitudes toward homosexuality are part of a larger belief system, and therefore, need to be examined as they relate to other forms of prejudice such as racism and sexism.

The following paragraphs will expand on some of the correlates of homophobia that are explored in the present study: gender, religion, and interaction.

Gender. Sex differences in the direction and intensity of attitudes toward gay people have been consistently found in research studies. For example, heterosexuals tend to have more negative attitudes toward gay people of their own gender than towards gay people of the opposite gender (Cuenot & Fugita, 1982; Herek, 1984b); however, more negative attitudes are manifested by males than by females (Hansen, 1982a; Herek, 1984b; Young & Whertvine, 1982). Morin and Garfinkle (1978) also noted that studies not finding gender differences tended to assess more general, cultural beliefs about homosexuality, rather than more specific, individual attitudes toward lesbians and gay men.

Herek (1986a) attributed the greater degree of homophobia in men than in women to the way the contemporary male role has been constructed. Heterosexual masculinity is specifically defined by descriptors such as "dominant" and "independent" and excludes sexual or very intimate relationships with other men. Britton (1990) suggested that homophobia may serve as a boundary between social and sexual interaction in our "homosocially stratified society." Therefore, male negative affective responses toward gay males in particular are more prevalent and pronounced than they are for women because gay males are perceived as a threat to their male gender role.

Little attention has been given to the question of whether heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men differ from those directed at lesbians. Heterosexual males report higher levels of homophobia toward gay males than lesbians; however, scores for attitudes toward lesbians often do not differ between female and male respondents (Cuenot & Fugita, 1982; Kite, 1984). Women who break with traditional gender role expectations may not be judged as severely by male heterosexuals as males who are perceived as

breaking a more valued gender role. This may explain why lesbians are less likely to be negatively stereotyped and are less likely to be rejected than are gay males (Steffensmeier & Steffensmeier, 1974).

Women may also be less homophobic than men because they share some empathy with gay people. Belonging to a group of individuals who are discriminated against may assist one in understanding others who also experience discrimination. Friedman and Doob (1968) found that individuals who viewed themselves as different (i.e., not accepting traditional gender roles) were more likely to accept others who were different (i.e., having a different sexual orientation).

Religion. Religious orientation also appears to be related to self-reported levels of homophobia. Those who attend church more frequently and subscribe to a conservative religious ideology tend to report higher levels of homophobia (Henley & Pincus, 1978). Irwin and Thompson (1977) found that Protestants and Roman Catholics were less tolerant of gay people than Jews, members of other religions, or nonaffiliates. Klassen, Williams, and Levitt (1989) reported that Fundamentalist Protestants were most likely and Jews least likely to hold high-negative attitudes toward gay people. Those with no religious affiliation scored almost as liberally as Jews. Nyberg and Alston (1976/1977) reported that regular weekly attenders of religious services were the most likely to hold negative attitudes; however, this relationship was stronger for Catholics than for Protestants. They also found that Episcopalian and Baptist active church attenders were more tolerant of gay people than Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran or other Protestant active church attenders.

Some researchers have suggested that religious moral prohibitions are the main source of homophobia; however, polls of American college students suggest that fewer and fewer students feel that homosexuality is morally wrong (Lehne, 1976). There was a drop from 42% in 1969 to 25% in 1974. This suggests that religious orientation may play a smaller role in explaining the variance in measures of homophobia than was previously thought.

Interaction. Heterosexuals with openly gay friends or acquaintances are more likely than others to hold accepting attitudes toward gay people (Gentry, 1987; Herek, 1984a, 1988; Schneider & Lewis, 1984). Part of this relationship may be explained by the observation that gay people may disclose their sexual orientation to those they think will be supportive (Schneider, 1986). However, knowing an openly gay person is correlated with lower levels of homophobia even in groups where hostility is prevalent, for example, among the highly religious or the uneducated (Schneider & Lewis, 1984).

In a survey of college freshmen, D'Augelli and Rose (1990) found that more than half of the students did not know a gay man casually, and few knew any gay men well. More contact with gay people was associated with more positive attitudes and greater concern

about the problems of gay people. D'Augelli (1989b) surveyed resident assistants-in-training and found similar results. Correlations were found between homophobia and close contact with gay men ($r = -.25$), and homophobia and casual contact with gay men ($r = -.31$). This effect was more pronounced for gay men than for lesbians. Thus, heterosexuals who positively interact with gay people are more likely to hold more accepting attitudes toward them.

Methodology

Sample and Population

Students enrolled in five sections of a human sexuality undergraduate course at a large southwest land grant university were asked to participate in the present study. The total number of students who completed the essential portions of the surveys was 320. Students with incomplete surveys and those who did not describe themselves as exclusively or predominantly heterosexual were excluded from the study.

Most of the subjects in the study were Caucasian (85 63%), followed by Hispanic (7.81%), African-American (3.44%), and Asian (3.13%) individuals. The sample was composed of 200 females (62.5%) and 120 males (37.5%). The sample consisted of mostly seniors (60.31%) and juniors (23.75%) with freshmen and sophomores making up a combined total of 15.63% of the sample. Most of the participants were single (97.19%); only 2.19% were married and .63% were divorced. Participants ranged in age from 17.91 to 28.81 years (mean = 21.49, SD = 1.39). Most subjects described themselves as either moderate (40.31%) or moderate/conservative (33.44%).

When asked to indicate whether they were heterosexual, bisexual, or homosexual, all 320 participants indicated that they were heterosexuals. However, when the 7-point Kinsey Scale was used, 93.13% of the subjects indicated that they engage in only heterosexual behavior and thoughts, 5.63% said they have exclusively heterosexual behavior and some homosexual thoughts, and only three participants (.94%) indicated that they have predominantly heterosexual behavior and some homosexual thoughts. For purposes of this study, participants were described as having a heterosexual orientation.

Data Collection

Students in the five human sexuality classes were invited to participate in the study. The researcher went to each class and described the importance of the study and told how much time it would take to complete the questionnaires. Students were allotted time during one of their class periods to complete the questionnaires. Because this study was part of another study, students completed some of the instruments during the pretest (PR), posttest (PT), and follow-up (FU) sessions.

Instrumentation

There were six instruments employed in the present study.

Demographics Questionnaire. The demographics questionnaire asked information about eight different areas: an identification code composed of the last four digits of the participant's social security number plus the first initial of the participant's mother's maiden name, date of birth, gender, ethnicity, college major, year in college, marital status, and number of children.

Correlates Questionnaire. The correlates questionnaire was developed for the present study to ascertain information about participants' sexual orientation, contact with lesbians and gay men, involvement in anti-gay behavior, interest in the topic of homosexuality, religious affiliation and involvement, and conservative-liberal classification. Information categories were selected from previous research studies that showed a correlation between homophobia and the category. For example, individuals who report having positive contact with lesbians and gay men are less homophobic than those with no contact or negative contact (D'Augelli & Rose, 1990).

Index of Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (IAH). The IAH contains 25 items and is reported to measure a unidimensional construct of homophobia on a purely affective basis (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). This scale was developed to measure the way a person feels about working or associating with gay and lesbian people. Each item is rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "1 = strongly agree" to "5 = strongly disagree". Both positive and negative statements about gay and lesbian people and their social interactions are used to control for response set biases. Examples of statements include: I would feel nervous being in a group of homosexuals. If a member of my sex made an advance toward me I would feel flattered. Persons who have very little dread of being in close quarters with gay and lesbian people tend to obtain very low scores on the IAH. Those who have considerable dread or discomfort tend to obtain higher scores.

Hudson and Ricketts (1980) used a scoring system that took into account omitted items and forced scores to fall between 0 and 100. For consistency and simplicity, this study used a scoring system yielding total scores ranging from 25 to 125. Scoring was achieved by first reverse scoring all of the negatively worded items (e.g., 1 = 5, 2 = 4, 4 = 2, 5 = 1, 3 remains unchanged). The total score was calculated by adding up all 25 item scores. If an item was omitted, the mean score for all other completed items on the scale for that particular person was substituted for the omitted item.

The psychometric properties of the IAH have been evaluated a number of times across different heterosexual samples. Hudson and Ricketts (1980), using a multi-ethnic sample of 300 persons, reported coefficient alpha at .9 and a Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) of 4.75. Construct validity was assessed by calculating the correlation between

IAH scores and the Sexual Attitude Scale; this correlation was .53. A factor analysis of the reliable variance of the IAH items produced a first unrotated factor that accounted for nearly 60% of the total item variance.

Despite the very high content validity, the researchers found four items that did not conform to their stated definition of homophobia. They recommended that these four items be replaced with four new items. This was done in the present study. Pagtolun-an and Clair (1986) used the revised IAH and obtained a reliability coefficient (coefficient alpha) for their data of .95.

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gay Men (ATLG). The ATLG is a 20-item scale using a Likert format with two 10-item scales: Attitudes Toward Gay Men (ATG) and Attitudes Toward Lesbians (ATL) (Herek, 1988). All items are totaled for an overall homophobia score. Examples of items include: Lesbians just can't fit into our society. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school. The 20 statements are presented to respondents in Likert-form with a 9-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Scoring is accomplished by summing scores across items for each subscale. Reverse scoring is used for some items. Total scores can range from 20 (extremely positive attitudes toward gay people) to 180 (extremely negative attitudes). Subscale scores can range from 10 to 90. For consistency, in the present study a 5-point Likert scale was employed for this and all other scales, therefore, the total scores could range from 20 to 100, with each subscale score ranging from 10 to 50.

In a study (Herek, 1988) involving 405 student volunteers at six different universities across the United States, calculation of coefficient alpha for the ATLG, ATG, and ATL yielded values of .95, .91, and .90, respectively, indicating a high degree of internal consistency. In a second study reported in the same article (Herek, 1988) using a sample of 368 undergraduates from a single university, reliability coefficients (alpha) were .90 for the ATLG, .89 for the ATG, and .77 for the ATL. As one validity check, the ATLG was administered to members of a local lesbian and gay organization (Herek, 1988); as expected, their homophobia scores were very low.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Form C (MCSDS). The MCSDS evaluates the tendency for individuals to give socially desirable answers to questionnaires. Using a 5-point Likert response format, items describe culturally approved behaviors that have a low incidence of occurrence and have minimal implications of psychopathology. Examples include: I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. Form C was developed by Reynolds (1982) and is a shortened form (13 items) of the original 33-item Marlowe-Crowne scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Scores on Form C from 608 undergraduate students (Reynolds, 1982) yielded a KR-20 reliability coefficient of .76.

Concurrent validity was established (Reynolds, 1982) by correlating Form C scores with scores from the standard version of the MCSDS (r = .93) and with scores from the Edwards Social Desirability Scale (r = .41). Reversed scoring is used for some items (i.e., items 5, 7, 9, 10, 13). Total scores range from 13 to 65, with higher scores reflecting a tendency to give more socially desirable answers to questionnaires.

Posttest Evaluation Questionnaire (PEQ). Finally, participants were asked to determine the degree to which they were willing to do a series of listed behaviors (e.g., read a book on gay/lesbian issues, stop someone telling an anti-gay joke). A Likert format ranging from "1 = definitely yes" to "5 = definitely not" was used. A total behavioral score was determined by summing the 10 item scores. Total scores can range from 10 to 50, with lower scores indicating a greater willingness to participate in gay positive activities and behaviors.

Results and Discussion

Gender Differences. To address hypotheses 1 and 2, means, standard deviations, and 95 percent confidence intervals were calculated for women and men separately for each administration of the homophobia measures (i.e., IAHPR, IAHPT, IAHFU, ATLPR, ATLPT, ATLFU, ATGPR, ATGPT, ATGFU, ATLGPR, ATLGPT, ATLGFU, PEQPR, PEQPT, AND PEQFU). Table 2 lists the means, standard deviations, and 95 percent confidence intervals for each of these measures by gender.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted for each set of means. Table 3 presents the results of the ANOVAs. Those p_{CALC} values indicating statistical significance at or below the .05 level are underlined. Differences in the means for men and women on the pretest and posttest of the IAH were statistically significant. Table 2 shows that there was little overlap among the 95 percent confidence intervals for men and women on each of these administrations.

Differences for means for total scores on the ATLGPR and ATLGPT by gender were statistically significant; however, only the differences on means for the subtest measuring homophobia toward gay men (i.e., ATGPR, ATGPT) were statistically significant. Differences in the means for the subtest measuring homophobia toward lesbians (i.e., ATLPR, ATLPT) were not statistically significant.

Differences on the means by gender for the total sample scores of PEQPT were also statistically significant. By examining the 95 percent confidence intervals in Table 1, there were no overlapping intervals for statistically significant means of the measures except small overlaps for ATLGPR and ATLGPT.

Table 4 presents the frequencies and percentages of correlates of homophobia for men and women. When asked the question, "Do you know any gay people?," 70% of the women in the sample and 60% of the men indicated that they did. Subjects reported the number of gay and lesbian people (or suspected) that they knew as friends, family members, and acquaintances. Forty-one percent of the women reported having one or more gay male friends compared with 34% of the men reporting the same. Seventeen percent of the women indicated that they have one or more family members who are gay; 13% of the men indicated the same. Sixty percent of the women in the sample said they have one or more acquaintances who are gay males; 68% of the men said the same. The 68% figure conflicts with the reported 60% of men who said they "knew" some gay people. The difference could be due to the ambiguity of the word "know" in the question.

Thirteen percent of the men in the study indicated that they have one or more lesbian friends; 20% of the women indicated the same. Four percent of the men said that they have one or more family members who are lesbian; 10% of the women said the same. Forty-two percent of the men reported having one or more lesbian acquaintances; 40% of the women reported the same.

Table 5 reports the type of contact subjects reported having with gay and lesbian people. Thirty percent of the women and 42% of the men reported having no contact with gay men. These figures closely match those reported from the question, "Do you know any gay people?" Five percent of the total women and 20% of the total men in the sample reported having "negative" or "very negative" contact with gay men. Many of the women and the men indicated that they had "neutral" contact with gay men (i.e., 34% and 23%, respectively). Thirty-three percent of the women and 16% of the men said they had "positive" or "very positive" contact with gay men.

In reporting type of contact with lesbians, 54% of the men and 49% of the women reported having no contact with lesbians. Eight percent of the men and 11% of the women said they had "negative" or "very negative" contact with lesbians. Many of the men (23%) and the women (28%) reported having "neutral" contact with lesbians. Fifteen percent of the men and 12% of the women indicated that they had "positive" to "very positive" contact with lesbians.

Within the last six months, 77% of the men and 39% of the women had used a homophobic term such as "faggot," "queer," or "dyke."

Correlates of Homophobia. To address hypotheses 3 and 4, three multiple regression analyses were run using all the correlate variables as independent variables and using each of the homophobia measures (i.e., IAHPT, ATLPT, ATGPT) separately as the dependent variables. The multiple regression analyses can assist in investigating the collective and separate contributions of the independent variables

(correlate variables) to the variation of the dependent variable (homophobia). The multiple R correlation coefficient expresses the magnitude of the relation between the best possible combination of all independent variables and the dependent variable (Kerlinger, 1979). R^2, which is similar to r^2, is the proportion of variance of Y accounted for by the regression combination of all the independent variables, excluding multiple counting of any area of Y variance jointly predicted by two or more of the predictors. In this study, R using IAHPT as the dependent variable was .671, R using ATLPT as the dependent variable was .648, and R using ATGPT as the dependent variable was .665. Therefore, 45.0%, 42.0%, and 44.2% of the variance of "homophobia" was explained by the combination of all the independent variables.

To consider the unique contribution each of the independent variables had on the dependent variable(s), three structure coefficients were calculated for each independent variable, one for each of the dependent variables. The independent variables FRIENDS1, FAMILY1, ACQUAIN1, and OTHERS1 refer to the number of gay male friends, family members, acquaintances, and others that the subject knew or suspected. The independent variables FRIENDS2, FAMILY2, ACQUAIN2, and OTHERS2 refer to the number of lesbian friends, family members, acquaintances, and others that the subject knew or suspected. Table 6 describes the other independent variables and provides a code for the scoring of these variables. Table 7 lists bivariate r's, multiple R's, structure coefficients, and squared structure coefficients for each independent variable. The structure coefficient for a predictor variable is equal to the bivariate correlation between the predictor variable and the dependent variable divided by the multiple R correlation coefficient (i.e., r_s of $x_i = r_{yxi}/R_{y(x1..xi)}$). The squared structure coefficient for a given independent variable indicates what percent of the explained variance in dependent variable Y can be accounted for by that variable alone.

Using IAHPT as the dependent variable, in order of highest percentage of between-subjects variance explained in the predictable portions of the dependent variable by a single independent variable (r_s^2), the following contributions were made: LIBCONS (61.1%), CONTACTG (50.7%), FRIENDS1 (18.5%), VERBHAR (15.8%), ACQUAIN1 (13.6%), ATTEND (13.1%), KNOWGAY (13.0%), CONTACTL (12.4%), FRIENDS2 (6.4%), GENDER (5.3%), ACQUAIN2 (3.3%), OTHERS1 (2.1%), and IMPORTAN (1.2%). Independent variables accounting for less than one percent of the explained variance include in descending order: FAMILY1, RELIGION, OTHERS2, FAMILY2.

Using ATLPT as the dependent variable, in order of highest percentage of between subjects variance explained by a single independent variable, the following contributions were made: LIBCONS (66.1%), CONTACTG (35.1%), ATTEND (22.0%), VERBHAR (14.4%), FRIENDS1 (11.4%), CONTACTL (10.3%), ACQUAIN1 (10.0%), KNOWGAY (5.4%), FRIENDS2 (4.6%), ACQUAIN2 (2.6%), RELIGION (2.6%), OTHERS1 (1.4%), and GENDER (1.2%). Independent variables

accounting for less than one percent of the explained variance include in descending order: FAMILY1, FAMILY2, OTHERS2, IMPORTAN.

Using ATGPT as the dependent variable, in order of highest percentage of regression variance explained by a single independent variable, the follow contributions were made: LIBCONS (65.6%), CONTACTG (38.9%), VERBHAR (18.0%), ATTEND (17.6%), FRIENDS1 (11.8%), GENDER (8.1%), CONTACTL (7.4%), ACQUAIN1 (7.1%), KNOWGAY (5.9%), FRIENDS2 (4.2%), ACQUAIN2 (2.9%), RELIGION (2.2%), and OTHERS1 (2.0%). Independent variables accounting for less than one percent of the explained variance include in descending order: FAMILY2, IMPORTAN, FAMILY1, OTHERS2.

For all three dependent variables, LIBCONS and CONTACTG consistently explained most of the variance. ATTEND, VERBHAR, and FRIENDS1 each explained 10% or more of the variance for all three dependent variables. CONTACTL, ACQUAIN1, and KNOWGAY each explained 5% or more of the variance for all three dependent variables.

Religiosity as a Correlate of Homophobia. Participants in the present study were classified in one of four religion categories based on the religious affiliation they listed. For example, if a person indicated that they were "Methodist," (s)he would be grouped in the "Protestant" category. Table 6 lists the other three categories. The bivariate correlation coefficients for religious classification and each of the dependent variables (i.e., IAHPT, ATLPT, ATGPT) were very modest, ranging from .018 to .104. However, when religiosity was measured by asking the number of times a person went to church in a given month, the correlations between ATTEND and the homophobia measures were much higher, ranging from .243 to .304. Thirty-one percent of the individuals in the sample indicated that they did not attend church at all, 18% said they attended church one time a month, 15% indicated twice a month church attendance, 13% said they went to church three times a month, 15% reported four times a month church attendance, and 30% listed numbers greater than four.

As stated earlier, RELIGION accounted for less than 3% of the explained variance in the multiple regression analyses, but ATTEND explained 13 to 22% of the between-subjects variance depending on which dependent variable measure was used.

Conclusions

1. **Women will report lower levels of homophobia than men in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral measures.**

This hypothesis was supported in most cases. The entire sample included 200 women and 120 men. As reported in Table 3, there were statistically significant differences between the group means on the pretest and posttest administrations of the ATLG, ATG (cognitive), and IAH (affective) and on the posttest administration of the PEQ (behavioral). The ATL was the only measure of homophobia that did not yield differences in means of men and women. This suggests that homophobia toward lesbians may be the same for heterosexual men and women, but that women tend to report lower levels of homophobia than men in terms of homophobic behaviors, cognitive male homophobia, and generalized affective homophobia.

2. **Both men and women will report lower levels of cognitive homophobia toward lesbians than gay men.**

This hypothesis was supported. The ATLG is the only instrument that separated homophobia toward lesbians from homophobia toward gay men. Consistently the mean scores for ATLPR, ATLPT, and ATLFU were respectively lower than the mean scores for ATGPR, ATGPT, and ATGFU, as reported in Table 2. By comparing the 95 percent confidence intervals of these two sets of means, none of them overlap. This indicates that for both men and women, lower cognitive homophobia levels were reported toward lesbians than gay men.

3. **Homophobia will negatively correlate with previous contact with gay men and lesbians, with the degree of positive previous interaction with gay people, and with the number of gay and lesbian friends, family members, and acquaintances.**

This hypothesis was supported. Table 7 shows the correlations between the dependent variable measures and the independent variables. Results from the multiple regression analyses using IAH, ATL, and ATG separately as the dependent variable, previous contact with gay men and lesbians (KNOWGAY) explained 5 to 13% of the regression variance, type of contact with gay men (CONTACTG) accounted for 35 to 51% of the between-subjects variance, and type of contact with lesbians (CONTACTL) explained 7 to 12% of the variance. Number of gay male friends (FRIENDS1), acquaintances (ACQUAIN1), and family members (FAMILY1) accounted for 11 to 19%, 7 to 14%, and less than 1% of the explained variance, respectively. Number of lesbian friends (FRIENDS2), acquaintances (ACQUAIN2), and family (FAMILY2) accounted for 4 to 6%, 3%, and 1% or less of the explained variance, respectively.

In the study 17% of the women and 13% of the men indicated that they suspected or were sure that they have gay males in their family. Ten percent of the women and 4% of the men reported having or suspected having family members who are lesbian. Simply having a gay or lesbian family member did not correlate with levels of homophobia.

Two of the most influential independent variables were LIBCONS (whether a person identifies as liberal, moderate, or conservative) which accounted for 61 to 66% of the regression variance, and VERBHAR (whether a person had said an anti-gay word within the last six months) which explained 14 to 18% of the between-subjects variance.

4. **Levels of self-reported anti-gay attitudes will positively correlate with religiosity (if someone is affiliated with a church and how often (s)he attends the church).**

This hypothesis was strongly supported for attendance but not for religious affiliation. RELIGION explained <1 to 3% of the regression variance; however, ATTEND explained 13 to 22% of the between-subjects variance, as reported in Table 7. This suggests that actual attendance in church or "devoutness" is correlated positively with homophobia, but that one's identification with a certain denomination may not be correlated highly with homophobia. This makes some intuitive sense, particularly since in the south individuals tend to label themselves with the religion that they grew up on and this does not necessarily indicated their current religious beliefs or "devoutness."

Limitations of the Study

The present research study had a number of limitations that must be considered in explaining the results. First, the generalizability may be limited to college-age undergraduate students. This sample contained mostly juniors and seniors from a variety of college majors, religious orientations, and liberal-conservative classifications. Over 14% of the sample were from ethnic minorities (i.e., Hispanic, African-American, and Asian). Women students made up nearly 63% of the sample.

Second, self-report measures often suffer from the under reporting of negative attitudes and behaviors. As a check against giving socially desirable answers, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale - Form C was administered to all the participants. Bivariate correlation coefficients of the MCSDS with each of the dependent variables (i.e., IAH, ATL, ATG) were very, very small (i.e., -.056, -.006, and -.041, respectively). These results suggest that individuals with higher social desirability scores did not have homophobia scores that were lower than how they actually felt.

Directions for Future Research

Research in the area of attitude change needs to move in the direction of considering what interventions can effectively reduce homophobia with certain subgroups of people (e.g., those who are homophobic and devout church attenders, males versus females, conservatives versus liberals, those with some contact with gay people and those with none). By tailoring interventions to specific groups, change in attitudes may be more likely to occur.

References

Aguero, J. E., Bloch, L., & Byrne, D. (1984). The relationships among sexual beliefs, attitudes, experience, and homophobia. Journal of Homosexuality, 10(½), 95-107.

Berrill, K. (1990). Anti-gay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5(3), 274-294.

Black, K. N., & Stevenson, M. R. (1984). The relationship of self-reported sex-role characteristics and attitudes toward homosexuality. Journal of Homosexuality, 10(½), 83-93.

Britton, D. M. (1990). Homophobia and homosexuality: An analysis of boundary maintenance. Sociological Quarterly, 31, 423-439.

Cameron, P., & Ross, K. P. (1981). Social psychological aspects of the Judeo-Christian stance toward homosexuality. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 9(1), 40-57.

Cavin, S. (1987). Rutgers sexual orientation survey: A report on the experiences of the lesbian, gay and bisexual members of the Rutgers community. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from S. Cavin, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901)

Conner, G., Richman, C. L., Wallace, S., & Tilquin, C. (1990). AIDS knowledge and homophobia among French and American university students. Psychological Reports, 67, 1147-1152.

Croteau, J. M., & Morgan, S. (1989). Combatting homophobia in AIDS education. Journal of Counseling and Development, 68, 86-91.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Cuenot, R. G., & Fugita, S. S. (1982). Perceived homosexuality: Measuring heterosexual attitudinal and nonverbal reactions. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8(1), 100-106.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989a). Lesbians' and gay men's experiences of discrimination and harassment in a university community. American Journal of Community Psychology, 17, 317-321.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1989b). Homophobia in a university community: Views of prospective resident assistants. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 546-552.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1991, August). Out on campus: Dilemmas of identity development for lesbian and gay young adults. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. (Available from Anthony D'Augelli, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, (814) 863-0241)

D'Augelli, A. R., & Rose, M. L. (1990). Homophobia in a university community: Attitudes and experiences of heterosexual freshmen. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 484-491.

DeCrescenzo, T. A. (1983/84). Homophobia: A study of the attitudes of mental health professionals toward homosexuality. Journal of Social Work & Human Sexuality, 2(2/3), 115-136.

Ernulf, K. E., & Innala, S. M. (1987). The relationships between affective and cognitive components of homophobic reaction. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 16, 501-509.

Ficarrotto, T. J. (1990). Racism, sexism, and erotophobia: Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuals. Journal of Homosexuality, 19(1), 111-116.

Friedman, J. L., & Doob, A. N. (1968). Deviancy: The psychology of being different. New York: Academic Press.

Gentry, C. S. (1987). Social distance regarding male and female homosexuals. Journal of Social Psychology, 127, 199-208.

Hansen, G. L. (1982a). Measuring prejudice against homosexuality (homosexism) among college students: A new scale. Journal of Social Psychology, 117, 233-236.

Hansen, G. L. (1982b). Androgyny, sex-role orientation, and homosexism. Journal of Psychology, 112, 39-45.

Henley, N. M., & Pincus, F. (1978). Interrelationships of sexist, racist, and antihomosexual attitudes. Psychological Reports, 42, 83-90.

Herek, G. M. (1984a). Beyond "homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Journal of Homosexuality, 10(½), 1-21.

Herek, G. M. (1984b). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A factor-analytic study. Journal of Homosexuality, 10(½), 39-51.

Herek, G. M. (1986a). The social psychology of homophobia: Toward a practical theory. Review of Law & Social Change, 14, 923-934.

Herek, G. M. (1986b). Sexual orientation and prejudice at Yale: A report on the experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual members of the Yale community. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from Gregory Herek, Department of Psychology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616)

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. Journal of Sex Research, 25, 451-477.

Herek, G. M. (1989). Hate crimes against lesbians and gay men: Issues for research and policy. American Psychologist, 44, 948-955.

Hudson, W. W., & Ricketts, W. A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. Journal of Homosexuality, 5, 357-372.

Irwin, P., & Thompson, N. L. (1977). Acceptance of the rights of homosexuals: A social profile. Journal of Homosexuality, 3(2), 107-121.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1979). Behavioral research: A conceptual approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Homosexuality, 10(½), 69-81.

Klassen, A. D., Williams, C. J., & Levitt, E. E. (1989). Sex and morality in the U.S. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Krulewitz, J. E., & Nash, J. E. (1980). Effects of sex role attitudes and similarity on men's rejection of male homosexuals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38(1), 67-74.

Lance, L. M. (1987). The effects of interaction with gay persons on attitudes toward homosexuality. Human Relations, 40, 329-336.

Laner, M. R., & Laner, R. H. (1980). Sexual preference or personal style? Why lesbians are disliked. Journal of Homosexuality, 5(4), 339-356.

Larsen, K. S., Cate, R., & Reed, M. (1983). Anti-black attitudes, religious orthodoxy, permissiveness, and sexual information: A study of the attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality. Journal of Sex Research, 19(2), 105-118.

Larsen, K. S., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: A likert-type scale and construct validity. Journal of Sex Research, 16, 245-257.

Lehne, G. K. (1976). Homophobia among men. In D. S. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role (pp. 66-88). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McDevitt, T. M., Sheehan, E. P., Lennon, R., & Ambrosio, A. L. (1990). Correlates of attitudes toward AIDS. Journal of Social Psychology, 130, 699-701.

Morin, S. F., & Garfinkle, E. M. (1978). Male homophobia. Journal of Social Issues, 34(1), 29-47.

Nelson, R., & Baker, H. (1990). The educational climate for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at the University of California at Santa Cruz, report from the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Community Concerns Advisory Committee, UCSC. Unpublished report. (Available from GLB Community Concerns Advisory Committee, University of California, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064)

Norris, W. P. (1991). Liberal attitudes and homophobic acts: The paradoxes of homosexual experience in a liberal institution. Journal of Homosexuality, 22, 81-120.

Nyberg, K. L., & Alston, J. P. (1976/77). Analysis of public attitudes toward homosexual behavior. Journal of Homosexuality, 2(2), 99-107.

O'Shaughnessey, M. E. (1987). Chancellor's campus-wide task force on sexual orientation: Final report. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from M. E. O'Shaughnessey, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne, Champagne, IL 61824)

Page, S., & Yee, M. (1985). Conception of male and female homosexual stereotypes among university undergraduates. Journal of Homosexuality, 12(1), 109-118.

Pagtolun-An, I. M., & Clair, J. M. (1986). An experimental study of attitudes toward homosexuality. Deviant Behavior, 7, 121-135.

Poling, A., Redmon, W. K., & Burnette, M. M. (1990). Stigmatization of AIDS patients by college students in lower-division psychology classes. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 64-70.

Reynolds, A. J. (1989). Social environmental conceptions of male homosexual behavior: A university climate analysis. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 62-69.

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, 119-125.

Scherer, Y. K., Wu, Y. B., & Haughey, B. P. (1991). AIDS and homophobia among nurses. Journal of Homosexuality, 21(4), 17-27.

Schneider, B. (1986). Coming out at work: Bridging the private/public gap. Work and occupations, 13(4), 463-487.

Schneider, B., & Lewis, I. A. (1984). The straight story on homosexuality and gay rights. Public Opinion, 7, 16-20, 59-60.

Schwanberg, S. L. (1990). Attitudes toward homosexuality in American health care literature 1983-1987. Journal of Homosexuality, 19(3), 117-136.

Shapiro, J. P., Cook, G. G., & Krackov, A. (1993, July). Straight talk about gays. U.S. News & World Report, pp. 42-48.

Steffensmeier, D. & Steffensmeier, R. (1974). Sex differences in reactions to homosexuals: Research continuities and further developments. The Journal of Sex Research, 10, 52-67.

Stephan, G. E., & McMullin, D. R. (1982). Tolerance of sexual nonconformity: City size as a situational and early learning determinant. American Sociological Review, 47, 411-415.

Stock, W. (1993). [Survey of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students at Texas A&M University]. Unpublished raw data. (Available from Wendy Stock, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, 935 E. Meadow Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303)

Whitehead, G. I., & Metzger, S. C. (1981). Helping behavior in urban and nonurban settings. Journal of Social Psychology, 114, 295-296.

Wisniewski, J. J., & Toomey, B. G. (1987). Are social workers homophobic? Social Work, 32, 454-455.

Yarber, W. L., & Yee, B. (1983). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and male homosexuality: Their affective orientation toward sexuality and sex guilt. Journal of American College Health, 31, 203-208.

Yeskel, F. (1985). The consequences of being gay: A report on the quality of life for lesbian, gay and bisexual students at the University at Amherst. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from Office of Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Concerns c/o Residential Ed West, 117 CanceHouse, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01103, (413) 545-4824)

Young, M., & Whertvine, J. (1982). Attitudes of heterosexual students toward homosexual behavior. Psychological Reports, 51, 673-674.

Table 1

Rates of Victimization of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Students at Five Universities and Colleges in Percentages

	Texas A&M (n=61)	Oberlin (n=111)	Penn St. (n=125)	Rutgers (n=141)	Yale (n=166)
Verbal Insults	75	40	76	55	65
Property Vandalized	33	5	17	6	10
Objects Thrown At	20	5	12	12	19
Followed or Chased	32	14	27	18	25
Spat Upon	17	5	5	1	3
Assaulted/Wounded	8	1	1	2	1
Punched, Kicked	13	3	5	4	5

Sources: Texas A&M (Stock, 1993), Oberlin (Norris, 1991), Penn State (D'Augelli, 1989a), Rutgers (Cavin, 1987), Yale (Herek, 1986b).

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and 95 Percent Confidence Intervals for all Administrations of Homophobia Measures by Gender

Measure	Mean	SD	n	95% CI
IAHPR				
WOMEN	86.33	18.53	95	82.55 to 90.11
MEN	95.58	17.65	65	91.20 to 99.95
IAHPT				
WOMEN	84.74	19.01	200	82.09 to 87.39
MEN	90.9	19.22	120	87.45 to 94.40
IAHEU				
WOMEN	83.81	18.48	105	80.23 to 87.38
MEN	86.51	19.81	55	81.15 to 91.86
ATLPR				
WOMEN	27.59	9.38	95	25.68 to 29.50
MEN	30.09	9.49	65	27.74 to 32.44
ATLPT				
WOMEN	27.04	9.60	200	25.70 to 28.38
MEN	28.50	10.37	120	26.63 to 30.38
ATLEU				
WOMEN	26.73	9.60	105	24.87 to 28.59
MEN	26.67	9.54	55	24.09 to 29.25
ATGPR				
WOMEN	31.12	9.62	95	29.16 to 33.08
MEN	36.83	9.82	65	34.39 to 39.25
ATGPT				
WOMEN	30.55	9.69	200	29.20 to 31.91
MEN	34.44	9.97	120	32.64 to 36.24
ATGEU				
WOMEN	30.33	9.31	105	28.53 to 32.13
MEN	33.05	10.52	55	30.21 to 35.90
ATLGPR				
WOMEN	58.71	18.56	95	54.93 to 62.49
MEN	66.91	18.50	65	62.33 to 71.50
ATLGPT				
WOMEN	57.59	18.87	200	54.96 to 60.23
MEN	62.94	19.62	120	59.40 to 66.49

Table 2, Continued

Measure	Means	SD	n	95% CI
ATLGFU				
WOMEN	57.06	18.59	105	53.46 to 60.66
MEN	59.72	19.51	55	54.45 to 65.00
PEQPR				
WOMEN	31.42	6.65	26	28.74 to 34.11
MEN	33.47	9.24	14	28.13 to 38.80
PEQPT				
WOMEN	29.62	7.92	200	28.52 to 30.73
MEN	35.11	8.97	120	33.48 to 36.73
PEQFU				
WOMEN	34.08	6.51	26	31.45 to 36.71
MEN	35.43	8.72	14	30.40 to 40.46

Table 3

One-way Analysis of Variance Results for Means of Homophobia Measures by Gender

Measure	df	Fcalc	p_{CALC}
IAHPR	1/158	9.98	.002
IAHPT	1/318	7.88	.005
IAHEU	1/158	.73	.394
ATLPR	1/158	2.73	.100
ATLPT	1/318	1.64	.201
ATLEU	1/158	.001	.970
ATGPR	1/158	13.32	≤.001
ATGPT	1/318	11.81	≤.001
ATGEU	1/158	2.82	.095
ATLGPR	1/158	7.57	.007
ATLGPT	1/318	5.85	.016
ATLGEU	1/158	.72	.399
PEQPR	1/38	.65	.424
PEQPT	1/318	32.52	≤.001
PEQEU	1/38	.31	.582

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages of Correlates of Homophobia for Men and Women

Question	Women Value	Frequency	%	Men Value	Frequency	%
Do you know any gay people?						
	yes	140	70.0	yes	72	60.0
	no	60	30.0	no	48	40.0
Number of friends you are sure or suspect are gay.						
	0	118	59.0	0	79	65.8
	1	40	20.0	1	21	17.5
	2	20	10.0	2	10	8.3
	≥3	22	11.0	≥3	10	8.3
Number of family members you are sure or suspect are gay.						
	0	166	83.0	0	104	86.7
	1	24	12.0	1	14	11.7
	≥2	10	5.0	≥2	2	1.7
Number of acquaintances you are sure or suspect are gay.						
	0	80	40.0	0	38	31.7
	1	43	21.5	1	24	20.0
	2	34	17.0	2	23	19.2
	3	13	6.5	3	16	13.3
	≥4	30	15.0	≥4	19	15.8
Number of friends you are sure or suspect are lesbian.						
	0	160	80.0	0	105	87.5
	1	22	11.0	1	9	7.5
	≥2	18	9.0	≥2	6	5.0
No. of family members you are sure or suspect are lesbian.						
	0	181	90.5	0	115	95.8
	1	15	7.5	1	3	2.5
	≥2	4	2.0	≥2	2	1.7

Table 4, Continued

Question	Women			Men		
	Value	Frequency	%	Value	Frequency	%
No. of acquaintances you are sure or suspect are lesbian.						
	0	121	60.5	0	70	58.3
	1	38	19.0	1	19	15.8
	2	24	12.0	2	13	10.8
	≥3	17	8.5	≥3	18	15.0

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages of Type of Contact with Gays and Lesbians and Use of Homophobic Terms for Men and Women

	Women		Men	
Question Label	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Quality of contact with gay men.				
no contact	59	29.5	50	41.7
very negative	4	2.0	9	7.5
negative	5	2.5	15	12.5
neutral	67	33.5	27	22.5
positive	45	22.5	14	11.7
very positive	20	10.0	5	4.2
Quality of contact with lesbians.				
no contact	98	49.0	65	54.2
very negative	5	2.5	5	4.2
negative	17	8.5	4	3.3
neutral	56	28.0	28	23.3
positive	16	8.0	18	15.0
very positive	7	3.5	0.0	0.0
Use of homophobic term within last six months.				
yes	77	38.5	92	76.7
no	123	61.5	28	23.3

Table 6

A Description of the Independent Variables and Their Scoring Codes

---

KNOWGAY
Do you know any gay people? (1 = yes, 2 = no)

CONTACTG
General type of contact person has had with gay men.
(0 = no contact, 1 = very negative, 2 = negative,
3 = neutral, 4 = positive, 5 = very positive)

CONTACTL
General type of contact person has had with lesbians.
(0 = no contact, 1 = very negative, 2 = negative,
3 = neutral, 4 = positive, 5 = very positive)

VERBHAR
Have you called another person a "fag," queer," "homo," or other similar term within the last six months?
(1 = yes, 2 = no)

LIBCONS
Self-report classification on liberal-conservative continuum.
(1 = liberal, 3 = moderate, 5 = conservative)

RELIGION
Religious Classification
(1 = none/atheist/non-christian, 2 = protestant,
3 = catholic, 4 = fundamentalist)

ATTEND
Number of times person attends church in one month.

IMPORTAN
Importance of the topic of homosexuality to the person.
(1 = extremely important, 2 = very important,
3 = important, 4 = somewhat important, 5 = not important)

Table 7

Multiple Regression Results for Three Separate Analyses
Using IAHPT, ATLPT, and ATGPT as Dependent Variables

Independent Variable	r_{yxi}	$R_{y(x1..xi)}$	r_s	r_s^2
LIBCONS				
y=IAH	.525	.671	.782	.611
y=ATL	.527	.648	.813	.661
y=ATG	.539	.665	.810	.656
CONTACTG				
y=IAH	-.478	.671	-.712	.507
y=ATL	-.384	.648	-.592	.351
y=ATG	-.415	.665	-.624	.389
VERBHAR				
y=IAH	-.267	.671	-.398	.158
y=ATL	-.246	.648	-.380	.144
y=ATG	-.282	.665	-.424	.180
ATTEND				
y=IAH	.243	.671	.362	.131
y=ATL	.304	.648	.469	.220
y=ATG	.279	.665	.419	.176
FRIENDS1				
y=IAH	-.289	.671	-.430	.185
y=ATL	-.219	.648	-.338	.114
y=ATG	-.229	.665	-.344	.118
ACQUAIN1				
y=IAH	-.248	.671	-.369	.136
y=ATL	-.205	.648	-.316	.100
y=ATG	-.177	.665	-.266	.071
CONTACTL				
y=IAH	-.236	.671	-.351	.124
y=ATL	-.208	.648	-.321	.103
y=ATG	-.181	.665	-.272	.074
KNOWGAY				
y=IAH	.242	.671	.360	.130
y=ATL	.150	.648	.231	.054
y=ATG	.161	.665	.242	.059

Table 7, Continued

Independent Variable	r_{yxi}	$R_{y(x1..xi)}$	r_s	r_s^2
FRIENDS2				
y=IAH	-.170	.671	-.253	.064
y=ATL	-.139	.648	-.214	.046
y=ATG	-.137	.665	-.206	.042
GENDER				
y=IAH	.155	.671	.231	.053
y=ATL	.072	.648	.111	.012
y=ATG	.189	.665	.284	.081
ACQUAIN2				
y=IAH	-.122	.671	-.182	.033
y=ATL	-.104	.648	-.160	.026
y=ATG	-.114	.665	-.171	.029
RELIGION				
y=IAH	.018	.671	.027	.001
y=ATL	.104	.648	.160	.026
y=ATG	.099	.665	.149	.022
OTHERS1				
y=IAH	.099	.671	.147	.022
y=ATL	.077	.648	.119	.014
y=ATG	.094	.665	.141	.020
IMPORTAN				
y=IAH	.073	.671	.109	.012
y=ATL	.008	.648	.012	<.001
y=ATG	.060	.665	.090	.008
FAMILY1				
y=IAH	-.061	.671	-.091	.008
y=ATL	-.063	.648	-.097	.009
y=ATG	-.052	.665	-.078	.006
FAMILY2				
y=IAH	-.028	.671	-.042	.002
y=ATL	-.057	.648	-.088	.008
y=ATG	-.066	.665	-.099	.010
OTHERS2				
y=IAH	.040	.671	.060	.004
y=ATL	.022	.648	.034	.001
y=ATG	.026	.665	.039	.002